

REMARKS

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §112:

Claim 32 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicants have amended the claim to obviate the rejection.

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §102:

Claims 19, 23, and 27-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wolff et al. (WO 00/75164). Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the rejection. Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 19 to recite that the polymers are amine-containing amphiphilic polyvinylether polymers. Support for the claims can be found in the specification on page 7 line 32 to page 8 line 23, Example 3, and FIG. 3. In view of the amendments, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 19, 23, and 27-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rozema et al. (US 2004-0156909). With this amendment, Applicants have submitted a request under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and a declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 showing that the prior art disclosure is not by another. In view of the declaration, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 19, 23, and 27-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lewis et al. (US 2003-0224055). With this amendment, Applicants have submitted a request under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and a declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 showing that the prior art disclosure is not by another. In view of the declaration, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103:

Claims 22 and 30-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. (WO 00/75164) in view of Wolff et al. (WO 00/03694). Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the rejection. Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 19 to recite that the polymers are amine-containing amphiphilic polyvinylether polymers. Support

for the claims can be found in the specification on page 7 line 32 to page 8 line 23, Example 3, and FIG. 3. In view of the amendments, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

The Examiner's rejections are now believed to be overcome by this response to the Office Action. In view of Applicants' amendment and arguments, it is submitted that claims 19, 22, 23, and 27-32 should be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kirk Ekena/
Kirk Ekena, Reg. No. 56,672
Roche Madison Inc.
465 Science Drive, Suite C
Madison, WI 53711
608-316-3896

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
transmitted to the USPTO on this date: 4/28/2009.

/Kirk Ekena/
Kirk Ekena